WD2239.B490.

App.F.IX-4]

1923-24

File No. 3/23

Previous References. (CB)

Serial Nos. 36(a), 49 to 56.

Reserve

Later references.

CB 148-49-142

GENERAL & REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos. 36(a), 49 to 56

Part B for Sept. 1925

SUBJECT

Representations of Messrs. R. A. Narasimha Iyengar, Srinarasimha Sastry, S. Reuben [S. N. Appanna Iyengar, S. N. Vyasa Rao] praying that their acting & subprotem service may be counted for calculation of increments

To The Supt, Rev. Surveys, The Comptroller, Mysore Govt
The Dy. Commr., Mysore
Rc 6157 Dt 5-9-25
States that the requests of Mr. R. A. Narasimha Iyengar, Mr. N. Vyasa Rao & others cannot be granted

To ~~Mr~~ Mr. S. Reuben & S. N. Srinarasimha Sastry
Rc 618-9 Dt 5/9/25
States that their request cannot be ~~Mr~~ granted

Serial No.
36(a)

From

The Supdt. Rev. Survey - No 189 A/26. 6.25

Forwards for favourable consideration a representation of Mr. R. Narasimha Iyengar, Asst. Commissioner, Survey Dept. that as in the case of non-gazetted service officers he may also be allowed to count his acting service as Asst. Commr. from 2.9.1917 to 9.2.1920 after the passing of the departmental test.

(1)

From

Mr. S. M. Sri Narasimha Sastry - retired Asst. Commr. - letter dt. 29.6.25

Requests that he may also be allowed to count his acting & substantive service from 2nd Sept 1916 to 9th Feb 1920 for the calculation of increments

(2)

From

Mr. S. Reuben, Retired Asst. Commr. - letter dt. 6.7.25.

Requests that he may be allowed to count his acting & substantive service from 15th Oct 1915 to 9th Feb 1920, for calculation of increments

(3)

From

The Supdt. Rev. Survey - No 2 dt 7.7.25

Forwards for favourable consideration a representation of Mr. H. Vijaya Rao that he may be allowed to count his acting & substantive service from 26.3.1914 to 16.11.1918 for calculation of increments

(4)

Demi-official orders on Mr. H. Vijaya Rao's interview dt. 10.7.25

Put up with compliments & for remarks

(Sd) A. R. B.
10.7.25

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

154

C.B. File No. 3 of 1923

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial No.

Draws orders on the interview slip of Mr. S.N. Srikantaramiah Sahib, Retired Supdt of Police

"For Secy. with compliments for a note"

(Sd) A.R.B.
17.7.25.

Financial Secretary's note on the slip

"Forwarded with compliments to the Chief Secy. The cases of Asst. Commrs are dealt with in Chief Secretariat".

(Sd) M.V.K.
17.7.25.

Chief Secy's orders:

This 'Put up soon'
(Sd) B.R.
18.7.25.

The Deputy Commr, Mysore - no. Dis H.C. 47/24-25 dt 21.7.25.

Forwards for favourable consideration representation from Messrs. G. Narayana Rao and S.N. Appanna Iyengar, Assistant Commissioners, requesting that they may also be allowed to count their acting and ad-hoc temporary service as Asst. Commrs, for calculation of increments

(5) & (6)

Chief Secretary's orders

Put up with all similar applications and a note soon

(Sd) B.R.
22.7.25.

The collection relating to the cases referred to has been put up for reference with Mr. C. Krishna Rao's case which is under circulation in Council. A copy of the case is put up. A note will be put up after this collection becomes available for reference.

initd 22.7.25. yes 25.7.25.

C.B. coll. 3 - 23 Sls 31 - 36 taken from Mr. C. Krishna Rao case for reference
11.8.25.

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

General and Revenue Secretariat.

(C.B. File No. 3 of 1923)

Serial No.

(7)

[illegible] Rao Bahadur [illegible] Retired [illegible] Rs. 24 [illegible] and [illegible] Request [illegible] Chief Service [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

4)

Serial No.

15-21-70 (C.B. 53-41) dated 6th Nov. 1923 where the pay of all these officers in the revised scale has been fixed with effect from 1st July 1923 on certain principles. In the last para of the above e.o. the cases of officers who were acting for long periods as Asstt. Commissioners were reserved for separate consideration. This reference is invited to the note (illegible) in C. B. File No. 3-23 Secs 31-36 where the question of giving increments to these acting and Sub-pro-tem Asstt. Comrs. has been fully discussed. All these officers were working for a number of years as Sub-pro-tem and acting Asstt Commissioners without getting any increment. It was considered desirable to allow them to count all the acting and Sub-pro-tem service put in by them upto 1st July 1923 for increment under the Annual Scale of Permanent and Provisionally Permanent Asstt Commissioners who, drawing increments of Rs 25 in 3 years under the old grade and so in their case credit was given for service put in by them upto the date of their last increment. This has resulted in some of the Civilians

M

General and Revenue Secretariat.

C.B. File No 316/87 3-167 of 1926

Serial No

(Special para 5-7)

Collection containing pages 11

getting their pay in the Civil Service and are therefore officers of the corresponding rank in the new Civil Service Cadre. As may be observed from Paras 56 to 60 of the note in C.B. File No. 316/87 Sec 31 to 36 that cases were made out of this aspect of the case also submitted for powers of Government. [illegible] 11/8/25.

The order dated 19th June 1925 was intended to apply to officers who were acting at the time in Asstt Comm's places and who were not included in the Civil Service Cadre. It adopted certain liberal principles for dealing with these cases in view of the fact that the acting officers had drawn no increments in the Asstt Comm's grade besides of fairly long service and this was a hardship in the application more liberal principles did not affect [illegible] other people as their permanent officers of this class had all been formed into the Civil Service Cadre with their places fixed and the several officers to whom the concession was shown in this case belonged to their particular dgs & and no question of seniority was involved.

Applications asking for the same concession being shown in their cases also have been received from 7 officers. Of these five are now in the

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

Serial No.

Civil Service, having been earned increments under the principle applied to the case of Civil Service officers drawn pay accordingly. Their places in the cadre are also fixed. They were not acting officers at the time this order was passed. The order is therefore inapplicable to their cases from all points of view. To apply it to their cases would be to show them a concession which was meant for people who had suffered a hardship which these men had not suffered; and would result in putting them over the heads of other officers in the Civil Service cadre who have always been senior to them. Thus Mr. Shamia Rao should get Rs. 25/- more than his juniors in the non-C.S. cadre does not matter to them who were once his seniors but now get less than he; in the Civil Service cadre but if for example Mr. Vijaya Rao should get some similar concession this day he would go over the heads of several people in that cadre who were permanent as on Council when he was officiating. This is so obviously unfair that it seems unnecessary to emphasise it. The other two applications are from Messrs Somarasimha Sastri and Reuben. They are both retired now. They had been provisionally confirmed confirmed before retirement and had drawn increments in their grades. The

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

General and Revenue Secretariat. C.S. File No. 3 of 1925.

Serial No.

G.O. of 19.6.25 is therefore inapplicable in their cases also. To give retrospective effect to the order in their cases might bring up a large number of applications from other retired officers who had acted as Asstt Comrs some time in the course of their service. This would be embarrassing. There is however no question of seniority and places involved in these cases as in the case of the five gentlemen from the Civil Service.

Much of the discontent that may be supposed to exist in this class of cases is due to the fact that Mr Shamrao had all of a sudden got an increment of Rs 175 and drawn some back pay. It must be remembered however that he had been acting for years before this promotion came to him and that when he got this promotion he got some of what he should be considered to have lost by a too strict interpretation of rule regarding acting pay to Collectors; also the order was meant for cases like his of men who were acting & still in service at the time it was passed.

15/8

(Ch Secy) The views noted above seem to be supported from the notes on record in File S-23 Pls 31-36 leading up to the G.O. of 19.6.25.

Dewan
(Hon'ble Secy)

15-8-25

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

Serial No.

In the case of officers permanent or provisionally permanent on the date from which the reorganization order was brought into force, it is not possible to reconsider the reasonableness or otherwise of the stage of pay they were drawing on that date. That stage must be taken as an immutable fact not open to revision. To reopen the past before that date would land us in many difficulties. I do not think these seven are the only cases of this kind. There are a large number of cases of this class, and it is out of the question to reopen them all with a view to revise and enhance the rates of pay drawn in the past going back to several years. We must stop somewhere and the starting point in the case of permanent and provisionally permanent men, has naturally been the stage of pay they were drawing under the old scale on the date of the reorganization order.

All the seven officers whose cases are dealt with in this file were permanent or provisionally permanent on the date of the re-organization order. Five of them are now in the Civil Service cadre. The other two have retired and one of them retired before the reorganization order came into force. In these circumstances none of these officers can just compare themselves with the men in the Non-Civil Service cadre and contend that the latter have gone above them. No question of relative positions between these

two

Serial No.

two classes of officers arises as they are borne on different ~~places~~ lists altogether.

One of them Mr. G.Narayana Rao requests that he may be placed in the Non-Civil Service list ar not in the Civil Service list. I am not sure if this request can be complied with. His case has been considered along with that of others simi-larly situated and I think it will be inconvenier if exceptions are made in favour of individual officers and that at their request.

In the circumstances stated above, I agree with the views expressed in the above notes.

(18/8/25)

The Officers concerned may be informed in the circ-, that their requests can not be granted.

Dewan) Typed

18/8/25

17.8

8/9

Two copies are submitted for approval

Another representation received from Mr. Sri Narasimha Sastry on the 25th instant is also placed in the file for perusal

28.8.25

3/9

Ch Secy)

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

General and Revenue Secretariat.

C.B. File No. 3 of 19 U

Serial No.

To

The Supdt., Rev. Survey, Cantonment

Deputy Com^r - Mysore

no. 615-7 & 5.9.25.

States that the request of Mr. R.A. Narasimha Iyengar, Mr. H. Vasudeva Rao & others cannot be granted.

To

Mr. S. Rewen & Mr. S.N. Sri Narasimha

Cashier - no. 618-9 & 5.9.25

states that their request cannot be granted.

B

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

51794

No 189

Office of the Superintendent,
Mysore Revenue Survey,

Dated, Bangalore 26th June 1925.

From

D. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A.,

Superintendent, Mysore Revenue Survey.

To

B. Ramaswamaiya, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Chief Secretary to the Government of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore, Bangalore.

GENL. & REV. SECTION
27 JUN 1925
G. D. SECTION

I have the honor to forward herewith the representation dated 26-6-1925 of Mr. R. A. Narasimha Iyengar, Assistant Superintendent, Revenue Survey for favourable consideration and to state that his work and conduct have been very satisfactory. His prayer seems fair and modest in the circumstances narrated by him.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

D. Srinivasa Iyengar
Superintendent.

26/6/25

From

R. A. Narasimha Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Assistant Superintendent, Mysore Revenue Survey.

To

B. Ramaswamiaya, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Chief Secretary to the Government of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore, Bangalore.

Sir,

I beg to submit the following representation for the favourable consideration of Government.

I was first appointed an acting Assistant Commissioner of the 5th class in a leave vacancy on 4th October 1916, on the principle of selection from the subordinate service then in vogue, and shortly after reversion, was appointed Assistant Commissioner and posted as Assistant Superintendent, Revenue Survey on a starting pay of Rs.250 per mensem from 2-1-1917. On 9-2-1920, I was confirmed as provisionally permanent in the regular cadre along with some others, being specially selected for confirmation out of the then acting and sub protem Assistant Commissioners, irrespective of seniority. I drew my first increment on 9-2-1923 as per old rules, and under the revised orders governing the incremental scale passed in July 1923, I was given an increment of Rs.25, from 1-11-23, my service from 2nd January 1917 to 8th February 1920, not having been taken into account in fixing my initial pay on 1st July 1925. Since Government have in their recent order fixing the initial pay of officers, some of whom were only recently confirmed, while others are still acting and sub pro tem in the Non-Civil-Service cadre, been graciously pleased to allow sub pro tem and even acting periods even prior to the date from which the reorganisation order was to take effect, for counting increments I beg that a similar treatment may be kindly meted out in my case, which stands on a better footing, as the fact of my confirmation in preference to some of the Officers who have now been confirmed will bear out, and it might be kindly ordered that I shall be allowed to count

count the three years service from 2nd January 1917 to 8th February 1920 for increment and arrears of pay from 1st July 1923, may also be kindly granted to me.

I beg to add that it cannot have been the intention of Government to make one fit for confirmation at a time when others were continued to be kept sub pro tem and acting, to suffer pecuniarily, and that my reasonable prayer for being placed on a parity at least with the latter class of Officers in regard to starting salary on 1st July 1923, may be kindly granted.

I beg to remain,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

R. N. Narasimha Aiyangar.
Asst. Comr.

Bangalore

Dated 26th June 1925

CS 2018

Basavangudi,

Bangalore City, 29th. June 1925

CS 3-13-49

From

Mr. S. N. Srinarasimha Sastry,

Retired Superintendent of Police.

To

B. Ramaswamiah, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Chief Secretary to the Government of

His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,

B A N G A L O R E .

Sir,

I beg to submit the following representation for the favourable consideration of Government.

1. Whem I was a District Economic Superintendent, I was given the rank and status of an Assistant Commissioner on the 2nd. August 1916, and was given the full pay of an Assistant Commissioner of V Class under the old scale. On 1st July 1918, I was made Sub Protem Assistant Commissioner, while continuing to be District Economic Superintendent. On 9th February 1920, I was confirmed as Provisionally Permanent Assistant Commissioner of the V Class in accordance with the principles governing the promotion of the Subordinate Officers to the Civil Service (Vide Para II. Clause (a) of the Civil Service Rules). On 9th February 1923, I was promoted to the IV Class of Assistant Commissioner under the old scale on a pay of Rs.300/-.

2. From 1st November 1923. I got the pay of Rs.325/- according to the revised scale of pay sanctioned to Civil Servants in July 1923. In fixing my pay at Rs.325/- on 1st November 1923. the period of my tenure as District Economic Superintendent with the rank and status of an Assistant Commissioner and as Sub Protem Assistant Commissioner was not taken into account, while the case of Acting and Sub-Protem Assistant Commissioners was reserved for separate orders of Government. In the meanwhile, I

was

was retired on Superannuation Pension from 26th August 1924.

3. Subsequent to my retirement, the Government have passed orders reorganising the cadre of Civil Servants and constituting a non Civil Service cadre and have also disposed of the question of the Starting Salary and increments of the acting and Sub Protem Assistant Commissioners subsequently confirmed (Vide G. O. No.2750-53 C.B.3-23-36, dated 19th June 1925). In this order they have been graciously pleased to take into calculation the total Acting and Sub Protem Services of these Officers up to the date of their confirmation and extended to them the benefit of the application of Article 83 C.(ii) of the Mysore Civil Service Regulations and they have also sanctioned such pay as these Officers would become entitled to on 1st.July 1923 with effect from that date.

4. I, therefore, beg to request that in my case also, which stands on a better footing than those recently confirmed and also those who still continue to be acting and Sub Protem; the same consideration may be shown to my service from 2nd August 1916 to 9th February 1920, the date when I was made Provisionally Permanent and arrears of pay from 1st July 1923 calculated as above up to the date of my retirement, sanctioned to me. I beg to add that it cannot have been the intention of Government to make one fit for confirmation at a time, when others senior to him were continued ~~confirmed~~ to be kept as Sub Protem, to suffer pecuniarily, and I pray that my reasonable request of being placed on a par at least with the latter class of Officers, may be kindly granted.

I beg to remain,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

S. N. Ramakrishna Sastry

RETIRED SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE

0C914

CB 38

To.

The Chief Secretary,
to the Government of Mysore,
BANGALORE.

CO 3-23-30

Sir,

I beg to submit the following representation for the favourable consideration of Government.

I was appointed to act as Assistant Commissioner 5th Class in October 1915 and was posted to Kadur District as District Superintendent of Police. On 1st July 1918, I was made Sub-pro-tem Assistant Commissioner and on 9th February 1920, I was confirmed as provisionnally permanent Assistant Commissioner of the 5th Class, in accordance with the principles Governing the promotion of subordinate officers to the Civil Service, vide para 11-Cl (a) of the Civil Service rules. On 9th February 1923, I was promoted to the 4th Class of Assistant Commissioners under the old scale on Rs. 300/- and from 1st November 1923 I got the pay of Rs. 325/- according to the revised Scale of pay Sanctioned to Civil Servants in July 1923. In fixing my pay at Rs.325/- on 1st November 1923, the period of my tenure as acting Assistant Commissioner and Sub-pro-tem Assistant Coommissioner was not taken into account. The case of acting and sub-pro-tem Assistant Commissioners at the time was reserved for separate orders of Government.

On 1st November 1924 I was given another increment of Rs. 25/- But before this increment was given to me, Governmant on 22nd September 1924 have passed orders reorganising the cadre of Civil Service and fixing my place in the non Civil Service cadre.

I was retired on 16th April 1926 and subsequent to my retirement Government have passed orders fixing the starting salaries of the acting and sub-pro-tem Assistant

Commissioners subsequently confirmed in their irder NO. 2750-53/ C.B. 23- 23-36 of 19th June 1925. In this order the Government nave been graciously pleased to take into calculation the total acting service of these officers up tp the date of confirmation and extended to them the benefit of the application of article 83 Cl. (ii) of the Mysore Service Regulations and they have sanctioned such pay as these officers would become entitled to on 1st July 1923 with effect from that date. I therefore beg to request that in my case also which stands on a better footing than those recently confirmed and those who still continue to be acting and sub-pro-tem, the same consuderation may be shown to my service from 18th October 1915 to 9th February 1920, the date when I was made provisionally permanent and arrears of pay from 1st July 1923 calculated as above upto the date of retirement sanctioned to me.

I beg to add that it cannot have been the intention of Government that while I was all along above Mr. R. Shama-Rau in rank, even as acting and sub-pro-tem Assistant Commissioner & was chosen for confirmation when his claims were overlooked, and when I have also been placed in the non-Civil Service cadre like him, I should be getting ~~less~~ pay and thus be made to suffer pecuniarily.

I therefore pray that my reasonable request to be treated at least on a par with Mr. Shama Rau, standing as I am in a much better position than him, may be kindly granted.

I beg to remain,

Dated 2nd July 25.

Your most obedient servant.

S Ramaiah

Retired Assistant Commissioner.

69 IV main Road Chamarajapet,

Bangalore City.

00954

No. 2 Encl

Office of the Superintendent,
Mysore Revenue Survey,
Dated, Bangalore 2nd July 1925.



From

Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A.,
Superintendent,
Revenue Survey & Settlement in Mysore.

C.B.41
C.B.3-23-31

To

B. Ramaswamaiya, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Chief Secretary to the Government of H.H.
the Maharaja of Mysore.

Sir,

I have the honour to forward herewith the representation dated 1st July 1925 of Mr. H. Vyasa Rao, Assistant Commissioner & Assista[illegible]icer, Revenue Survey Department for favourable consideration and to state that his work and conduct have been very satisfactory. His prayer seems fair and modest in the circumstances narrated ~~xxxxxx~~ in the last para of his representation; viz., that he is entitled to the same increment and the arrears of pay that have been sanctioned in the case of Mr. R. Shama Rao who was made sub-protem six months after Mr. Vyasa Rao's confirmation as

Assistant

From

H. Vyasa Rao, Esq., B.A.,

Assistant Commissioner & Assistant Settlement Officer,

Mysore Revenue Survey, Bangalore.

To

B. Ramaswamaiya, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Chief Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,

B a n g a l o r e.

Sir,

I beg to place the following representation for the kind consideration of Government.

After serving for a period of 20 years in the General and Revenue Secretariat and the Revenue Survey Department, I was promoted to act as an Assistant Commissioner on 26th March 1914 and was made sub-protem on 12th November 1916 as Assistant Commissioner and Assistant Settlement Officer. I was confirmed in the place on 16th January 1918 along with several other officers who were up to then sub-protem.

Under the orders of 1923 sanctioning annual increments, I am to get Rs.400 from 1-7-1925. I may be permitted to mention that for 7 years I was continued stationary on a pay of Rs.250 and my first increment was allowed only in 1921.

The recent orders sanctioning enhanced pay to several officers who were up to now either acting or sub-protem Assistant Commissioners allow increments even for the acting and sub-protem periods. Mr. R. Shama Rao, Superintendent of Police, who was made sub-protem on 1st July 1918, 6 months after I was confirmed, has been allowed to draw a pay of Rs.375 on 1st May 1923, 400 on 1st May 1924, and 425 on 1st May 1925, on the basis of previous acting and sub-protem services being calculated for promotion. I beg to submit that my case stands on a better footing in every way, and the present distinction of

allowing a higher pay to one with less service in the higher grade than to a permanent officer who was all along the senior, and who was confirmed long before the order conferring even a sub-protem promotion to the former, is very prejudicial to me As it cannot have been the intention of Government to overlook my claims, I beg to request that a similar treatment may be graciously accorded to me, and that I may be granted the increment and the arrears of pay on the same principle as has been applied to the case of Mr. R. Shama Rao and others. Such a gracious act will enable me to get a few more rupees for the pension which I have to expect after 2½ years.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

H Shama Rao

Assistant Commissioner
& Assistant Settlement Officer.

Bangalore,
1st July 1925.

D.S. no. 26

DIARY NO. 1178
19 — 19
Section.
File No

From

H. Vyasa Rao, Esq., B.A.,

Assistant Commissioner & Assistant Settlement Officer,

Mysore Revenue Survey, Bangalore.

CB78

To

B. Ramaswamaiya, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Chief Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,

Bangalore.

Sir

I beg to place the following representation for the kind consideration of Government.

After serving for a period of 20 years in the General and Revenue Secretariat and the Revenue Survey Department, I was promoted to act as an Assistant Commissioner on 26th March 1914 and was made sub-protem on 12th November 1916 as Assistant Commissioner and Assistant Settlement Officer. I was confirmed in the place on 16th January 1918 along with several other officers who were up to then sub-protem.

Under the orders of 1923 sanctioning annual increments, I am to get Rs.400 from 1-7-1925. I may be permitted to mention that for 7 years I was continued stationary on a pay of Rs.250 and my first increment was allowed only in 1921.

The recent orders sanctioning enhanced pay to several officers who were up to now either acting or sub-protem Assistant Commissioners allow increments even for the acting and sub-protem periods. Mr. R. Shama Rao, Superintendent of Police, who was made sub-protem on 1st July 1918, 6 months after I was confirmed, has been allowed to draw a pay of Rs.375 on 1st May 1923, 400 on 1st May 1924, and 425 on 1st May 1925, on the basis of previous acting and sub-protem services being calculated for promotion. I beg to submit that my case stands on a better footing in every way, and the present distinction of

llowing a higher pay to one with less service in the higher grade than to a permanent officer who was all along the senior, and who was confirmed long before the order conferring even a sub-protem promotion to the former, is very prejudicial to me. As it cannot have been the intention of Government to overlook my claims, I beg to request that a similar treatment may be graciously accorded to me, and that I may be granted the increment and the arrears of pay on the same principle as has been applied to the case of Mr. R. Shama Rao and others. Such a gracious act will enable me to get a few more rupees for the pension which I have to expect after 2½ years.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Assistant Commissioner
& Assistant Settlement Officer.

Bangalore,
1st July 1925.

CS 1e 98.m43 17.7.25

REPRESENTATION of Mr.S.N.Sri Narasimha Sastry

Retired Assistant Commissioner

270

Most Respectfully Submitted to the Dewan Saheb.

When I was a District Economic Superintendent, I was given the rank and status of an Assistant Commissioner on the 2nd August 1916, and was given the full pay of an Assistant Commissioner of the 5th Class under the old scale. On 1st July 1918, I was made Sub Protem Assistant Commissioner while continuing to be District Economic Superintendent. On 9th February 1920, I was confirmed as Provisionally Permanent Assistant Commissioner of the 5th Class in accordance with the principles governing the promotion of Subordinate Officers to the Civil Service. (Vide para 2, Clause (a), of the Civil Service Rules). On 9th February 1923, I was promoted to the 4th Class of Assistant Commissioner under the old scale on Rs.300/-.

From 1st November 1923, I got the pay of Rs.325/- according to the revised scale of pay sanctioned to Civil Servants in July 1923. In fixing my pay at Rs.325/- on 1-11-1923, the period of my tenure as District Economic Superintendent with the rank and status of Assistant Commissioner and as Sub Protem Assistant Commissioner, was not taken into account. The case of Acting and Sub Protem Assistant Commissioners at the time was reserved for separate orders of Government. In the meanwhile, I was retired on Superannuation Pension from 26th August 1924. Subsequent to my retirement, Government have passed orders reorganising the cadre of Civil Servants and constituting a non-civil service cadre and have also disposed of the question of the starting salary of the Acting and Sub Protem Assistant Commissioners subsequently confirmed, in their Order No. 2750-53 C.B. 3-23-36 dated 19th June 1925. In this Order, they have

have been graciously pleased to take into calculation the total Acting Service of these Officers up to the date of confirmation and extended to them the benefit of the application of Article 83 C (ii) of the Mysore Civil Service Regulations, and they have sanctioned such pay as these Officers would become entitled to on 1st. July 1923, with effect from that date.

I, therefore, beg that in my case also, which stands on a better footing than those recently confirmed and those who still continue to be Acting and Sub Protem, the same consideration may be shown to my service from 2nd August 1916 to 9th February 1920, the date when I was made Provisionally Permanent and the arrears of pay from 1st July 1923 calculated as above up to the date of my retirement and the increments due, sanctioned to me.

I beg to add that it cannot have been the intention of Government to make one, fit for confirmation at a time, when others senior to him were continued to be kept as Sub Protem, to suffer pecuniarily, and I pray that my reasonable request to be placed on a par at least with the latter class of Officers, may be kindly granted.

BANGALORE,
16th. July, 1925.

V. N. Ramachandra Rao

RETIRED ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER.
Basavangudi
BANGALORE.

CB. 152

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
MYSORE DISTRICT,

Dated Mysore, 21st July *192* 5.

CB 3-23-52

From

A.V. Ramanathan, Esq. B.A.,
DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
MYSORE DISTRICT.

To

B. Ramaswamaiya, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Chief Secretary to Government,

Bangalore.

Sir,

I have the honor toforward herewith for favour of consideration a representation from Messrs. G.Narayana Rao and S.N. Appanna Iyengar, Assistant Commissioners regarding their supersession by a junior in consequence of Government Order No. 2750-5-3-CB. 3-23-26 dated 19th June 1925.

2. The cases of these two officers are a rather hard one. A junior Mr. Shama Rao who had no permanent appointment in the Gazetted ranks till 1924 has superseded them in respect of pay, even though Messrs. Narayana Rao and Appanna Iyengar were confirmed in the Gazetted rank over 6 years previously. This has resulted from the fact that Mr.Shama Rao has been given the advantage of his entire acting period on Rs 250/- for calculating his initial pay under the reorganisation scheme, while Messrs. Narayana Rao and Appanna Iyengar were only given the benefit of the period they had served on the pay they were drawing at the time of reorganisation. Their complaint is therefore a just one.

3. The work of both these officers has been satisfactory and

and they have been applying themselves to their duties with energy and enthusiasm. Their prayer deserves the favourable and sympathetic consideration of the Government

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

Mysore,

Dated, 15th July 1925.

To

The Chief Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,

B A N G A L O R E.

Through

The Deputy Commissioner,

Mysore District.

From

G. Narayana Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Assistant Commissioner
doing duty as Personal Assistant to the
Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District.

Sir,

I beg to place before you the following representation for the favourable and sympathetic consideration of the Government:

In the Government Order No. 2750-53-C.B.3-23-36 dated 19th June 1925 certain principles to be adopted in fixing the salary etc., of acting and Subprotem Assitant Commissioners, have been laid down and in pursuance thereof certain Officers have been made permanent and given increment.

The principles laid down in the above Government Order have operated in giving effect to the time scale of pay to acting and subprotem Assistant Commissioners practically from the date they have been drawing a salary of Rs 250/- whether as acting or as subprotem Assistant Commissioners. Though this liberal and benovelent act of Government has greatly benefitted several Officers who were acting and subprotem for long periods, it has, particularly in my individual case, resulted in my supersession in point of pay by an officer who is much my junior, both in total length of service and service as acting and subprotem Assistant Commissioners. I refer to the case of Mr. R. Shama Rao, who as will be seen

from the statement given below, is my junior both in total service and service as acting and subprotem Assistant Commissioner; and yet as a result of the above-mentioned Government Order his salary on 1st July 1923 has been fixed as Rs 375/-, on 1st May 1924 as Rs 400/- and on 1st May 1925 as Rs 425/-. But in my case although I was appointed as acting Assistant Commissioner from 4th January 1914 and subprotem Assistant Commissioner from 15th September 1914 and I have been drawing Rs 250/- from the latter date viz 15th September 1914, while Mr. Shama Rao has been drawing Rs 250/- from 4th March 1916 as stated in the Government Order itself, I have been started on Rs 350/- on 1st July 1923 and thus Mr. Shama Rao who rises to Rs 450/- on 1st May 1925 gets practically two increments in advance of me although he is more than 2 years my junior as acting Assistant Commissioner. The following statement shows the services of Mr. Shama Rao and myself:-

	Mr. R. Shama Rao.	Mr. G. Narayana Rao
1. Date of entry into service.	13-6-1898	15-7-1892
2 Date of promotion as Ag. Asst.Commissioner which continued without interruption.	18-11-1915	4-1-1914
3. Date from which pay of Rs 250/- was drawn.	4-3-1916	15-9-1914
4. Date on which made subprotem.	1-7-1918	15-9-1914
5. Date of confirmation.	22-9-1924	16-1-1918

It will be seen from the above that although I have been drawing Rs 250/- from 15-9-1914 and Mr. Shama Rao from 4-3-1916, the latter has been started on a higher salary than myself on 1-7-1923 and now actually draws almost two

increments in advance, solely because I was confirmed as an Assistant Commissioner from 16-1-1918, and in consequence included in the Civil Service Cadre as per subsequent orders.. My confirmation from 16-1-1918 has thus operated to bring about my supersession in point of pay by a junior instead of as might be expected, giving an advantage over him in that respect. I beg to state that the conditions under which Mr. Shama Rao and myself and some others were appointed as Acting Assistant Commissioners from the subordinate grades as per principles adopted in 1913 and on wards, were exactly the same and in accordance with the Rule of seniority etc., I was made subprotem from 15-9-1914 along with Messrs. B. Narayanaswamiengar, M.S. Ramachandra Rao and M. Sadasiva Rao who are all Senior Assistant Commissioners now and Mr. Shama Rao had no place at all then even as an acting Assistant Commissioner. It may not be out of place to state that if Mr. Shama Rao had been confirmed or made provisionally permanent earlier along with others appointed about the same period, his pay on 1-11-1925 would have been Rs 375/- only.

I therefore pray that I should not be denied the benefit of the liberal intentions of Government Order under advertance, simply because I was confirmed earlier and subsequently retained in the Civil Service Cadre and a junior given advantages which the Rules of recruitment then in force or the revised rules fixing time scale of pay to Assistant Commissioners never contemplated.

I submit herewith for favour of perusal, copy of a letter sent to Government by Dewan Bahadur Raja Sabha Bhushana C. Srikantesvara Iyer, President, Mysore City Municipal Council to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, recommending my prayer for confirmation calculating my subprotem service as Assistant Commissioner and to grant me Personal Allowance. The Rules then in force did not allow of this prayer being granted. But the present gracious

order of Government had given retrospective effect to the time scale of pay in the case of acting and subprotem Assistant Commissioners as stated above.

I therefore pray that consistently with the principles laid down in the Government Order of the 19th June 1925 above referred to and in consideration of the fact that I am senior to Mr. K. Shama Rao, both in total service and service as Assistant Commissioner and that both of us were promoted to the grade of Assitant Commissioners in 1913 and 1914 under exactly similar conditions and prospects and I am also like Mr. Shama Rao at the fag end of my service. Government may be graciously pleased to extend to me the benefit of the principles laid down in the Government Order referred to and give me increments calculated on those principles. By this concession my salary on 1st July 1922 will be Rs 375/-, on 1-7-23 Rs 400/- on 1-7-24 Rs 425/- and on 1-7-25 Rs 450/- or Rs 50/- more than what I would get now. If it is considered that by giving me this revised rate of salary there will be any supersessions in the Civil Service Cadre, I would pray that the extra amount of Rs 50/- may be kindly treated as personal allowance until absorbed in the usual course and my place in the Civil Service Cadre left undisturbed. ~~Failing that I may be granted a few Rupees etc as~~ or I may be transferred to the non-civil Service Cadre and given the Senior Grade allotted to that Cadre as I will be the Senior in that Cadre. This will add a few Rupees to my pension ~~personal~~ and I pray that this request may be favorably considered. For this act of kindness and justice, I shall as in duty bound, ever pray.

I beg to remain,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

G Narayana Rao

Regd. No. 64/18-9-18 18th September 1918.

B. Ramaswamaiya, Esquire., B.A., B.L.,

Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore, Revenue Department,

Bangalore.

In forwarding herewith for the very favourable consideration of Government, Mr. G. Narayana Rao's representation, I have the honor to state, that I have had personal knowledge of him both as an Amildar and Police Officer and judging also from what he has been as Vice-President of this City Municipal Council, I consider him to be an efficient, capable and experienced Officer who fully deserves not only confirmation from the January 1917 but also the continuance, as personal allowance of the difference between his pay and the salary he has now been getting till his next promotion in the ordinary course, in recognition of his hard work onerous and responsible duties which he has cheerfully and willingly discharged with credit.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Sd. C. Srikantesvara Iyer,

PRESIDENT.

Copy

From,

S.N.Appannaiengar, Esqr, BA.,BL.,
Assistant Commissioner,
Nanjangud Sub Division,
N a n j a n g u d.

To,

B.Ramaswamiah, Esqr, B.A.,B.L.,
Chief Secretary to Government to
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore
B A N G A L O R E.

Through

A.V.Ramanathan, Esqr, B.A.,
Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District,
M Y S O R E.

Sir,

I beg respectfully to submit that, under para 3 (1) of Government Order No. 2750-53/C.B.3-23-36 dated 19-6-1925, all the Non-Civil Service Assistant Commissioners were given the benefit of reckoning the entire period of their acting and Sub-protem since put in by them up to 1-7-22 towards increments under the annual scale as two-thirds of service whi in the case of Civil Service Officers (Schedule B), the acting and Sub-protem service rendered by them prior to confirmation was entirely neglected, taking only towards incremental pay two-thirds of their service from the last increment. I need hardly say that Non-Civil service Assistant Commissioners who remained acting without confirmation till the date of the Government Order of 19-6-1925, have been placed at a greater advantage than those who were confirmed years ago, in so far as the entire ~~service~~ portion of their acting service was reckoned in fixing their pay or salary in the progressive scale of pay. Without going into the concrete cases of the latter class of Officers, I would submit that I was merely officiating for so long as 6 years before I was made Sub-protem on 10-4-1916 and confirmed on 16-1-1918, drawing the minimum pay of Rs. 250/- all those 8 years. If the benefit of the principles enunciated in the Government Order of 19th June 1925 is extended to me, I should get Rs. 450/- from 17th July 1923.

It is perhaps withing the knowledge of Government that all those who passed the Mysore Civil Service Examination held in 1901 and entered

entered service as Probationers like me are now in the grade of Senior Assistant Commissioners and above. I am the only Officer left behind inspite of my hard and trying work in the Malnad as Special Revenue Officer, Malnad Improvement Scheme, and as also Secretary of the Agriculture Committee of the Economic Conference, for over four years.

I beg that I may be allowed to draw Rs. 450/- from 1-7-1923 - without prejudice to the claims of my seniors, the difference between their pay and my pay being treated as absorbable personal allowance.

I beg to remain
Sir
Your most obedient servant

M appaswamiah

Assistant Commissioner,
Nanjangud Sub Division.

Dated July 1925
N a n j a n-g u d

D.O. no. 49

CB 3-23-53

CB 187

To

Sir A. R. Banerji, Kt
Dewan of Mysore
Bangalore

Subject

Sir,

I beg to submit the following representation for your kind and favourable consideration.

I was appointed to act as Assistant Commissioner I class, in October 1915. On 1st July 1918, I was made sub proden Assistant Commissioner & 9th February 1920 I was confirmed as provisionally permanent Assistant Commissioner of the I class in accordance with the principles governing the promotion of subordinate officers to the Civil Service vide para 11 cl. (a) of the Civil Service rules. On 9th February 1923 I was promoted to the 4th class of Assistant Commissioners, under the old scale, on Rs 300/- and from 1.11.1923, I got the pay

of Rs 325/ according to the revised Scale of pay sanctioned to Civil Servants in July 1923 in fixing my pay at Rs 325/- on 1.11.1923, the period of my tenure as acting and Sub Prodein Assistant Commissioner was not taken into account. The case of the acting and Sub Prodein Assistant Commissioners at the time was reserved for separate orders of Government

On 1st November 1924, I was given an annual increment of Rs 25/-. But before this increment was given to me, Government on 22nd September 1924, have passed orders reorganizing the Cadre of Civil Service, and fixing any place in the new Civil Service Cadre

I was retired from 16th April 1924 and subsequent to my retirement, Government have passed orders, fixing the salaries of the acting and Sub Prodein Assistant Commissioners, subsequently confirmed in their orders —

No. 2750 - 53/CB. 3-23-36

By 19th June 1925 the Govt. have been graciously pleased to take into calculation the total actual service of these officers upto the date of confirmation and extended to them the benefit of the application of Rule 83 C(1) of the Mysore Civil Service Regulations and they have sanctioned such pay as these officers would become entitled to on 1st July 1923 with effect from that date I therefore beg to request that in my case also which stands on a better footing than those recently confirmed & those who still continue to be acting & not proven, the same consideration may be shown to my service from 15th October 1915 to 9th February 1920 the date when I was made provisionally permanent and arrears of pay from 22nd July 1923 calculated as above upto the date of retirement sanctioned to me

I beg to add that it cannot have been the intention of the

Government that both I was all along above Mr R Shama Rao even as acting and both proben Assistant Commissioners and was chosen for confirmation when his claims were also looked and when I have also been placed in the non-civil Service Cadre like him I should be getting less pay and thus be more superseniorly. I therefore pray that my reasonable request to be treated at least as a par with Mr R Shama Rao, standing as I am in a much better position than him, may kindly be granted

I beg to remain
Sir
Your most obedient servant

S Ramiah
Ret Assistant Commissioner
101, 2nd Road, Chamarajpet
24th July 1925 Bangalore City

C6763

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

In reply please refer to No. GAD.107.



Comptroller's Office, Bangalore,

Dated the 7th August 1925

CS-316
CS 3-23-54

To

B.Ramaswamaiya Esq., B.A.,B.L.,

offg: Chief Secretary to ~~the~~ Government of Mysore,
Bangalore

Sir,

I have the honour to forward herewith for favourable consideration, a representation from Mr.T.Hanumantha Rao, Assistant Comptroller, State Huzur Treasury, Bangalore, requesting that the period of his service as acting Assistant Commissioner ~~he~~ *be* also taken for purpose of fixing his salary on 1st July 1923 in the revised grade 250-25-450 as in the case of Acting and Sub-pro-tem Assistant Commissioners who are now put into the non Civil Service ~~Ca~~ Cadre.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

T. Satyanarayana Rao
Comptroller.
213 7.8.25

U.

Returned, the direct to Government ... reference ... being against the rules. B. Ramaswamaiya

18.7.25

From

T. Hanumantha Rao, B.A., B.L.,
Assistant Comptroller,
State Huzur Treasury, Bangalore.

To

B. Ramaswamaiya, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Chief Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
Bangalore.

Sir,

In representing that the principle of the Government Order No.2750-53 C.B. 3-23-36 dated 19th June 1925 under which all non-Civil Service Assistant Commissioners have been allowed to reckon 2/3 of the entire period of their acting and sub-pro-tem service up to 1st July 1922 towards increments under the annual scale, has not been applied to me as belonging to Civil Service Assistant Commissioners, Schedule B, and in requesting that Government be graciously moved to order that the omission be now supplied and the principle applied to my case as well, I beg to submit the following.

That the principle of the Government Order has not been applied to my case is clear for had it been applied my pay would have been fixed at Rs375/- instead of at Rs300/- viz., at Rs75/- more from 1st July 1923 as per calculation noted below:-

	From	To	Period Y.	M.	D.
Ag. Asstt. Commr.	7-11-15	25-2-16	0	3	15
Provisionally permanent	2- 6-16	9-2-20	3	8	0
	9- 2-20				
		Total	3	11	15

or four years.

Service to be reckoned for increment 2/3 of 4 = 2 2/3.

The non Civil Service Assistant Commissioners who under the

the Government Order have been allowed to reckon their acting and sub-pro-tem service towards increments under the annual scale remained acting without confirmation till the date of the Government Order and the result of the Government Order is to place them now at a greater advantage than the Civil Service Assistant Commissioners who were all confirmed years before the non Civil Service Assistant Commissioners while, in my individual case, I had to remain officiating for nearly two years and four months before I was made sub-pro-tem on 1st July 1918 and provisionally permanent on 9th February 1920, drawing all these four years only the minimum pay of Rs.250/-

In conclusion I request that the principle of the Government Order of 19th June 1925 be graciously extended to me and I be permitted to count my acting and sub-pro-tem service towards increments and to draw from 1st July 1923 the addition of Rs.75/- per mensem that, I believe, would be due if the principle were applied to me.

I beg to remain,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

J. Alexander Mathew

Assistant Comptroller,
State Huzur Treasury.

Bangalore,
17th July 1925

Ry 3 01
Bangalore 08950

CB 448

Basavangudi,

Bangalore, Dated 24-8-1925.

From

Mr. S. N. Srinarasimha Sastry,
Retired Assistant Commissioner,



To

The Chief Secretary to
the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
B A N G A L O R E.

Sir,

In continuation of my representation praying for increase of pay as per recent orders relating to the reorganisation of the Civil and other Services, I beg that the following points may also be kindly placed before Government for their kind and sympathetic consideration:-

1. The G. O. of 19th. June 1925 applied to all Officers who were Acting and Sub Protem Assistant Commissioners, on the date of the Government Order, and to future recruits to this cadre.

2. The G. O. gives retrospective effect in the case of the above Officers and to the scale of increments sanctioned in 1923, when the time scale of annual increments was introduced in the case of Assistant Commissioners.

3. The G. O., while giving special advantages to Acting and Sub Protem Officers, does not take into consideration the claims of permanent and Provisionally Permanent men, who entered service under the same conditions as the Acting and Sub Protem men, who are now benefitted by the above G. O.

4. It is not true that all the Permanent and Provisionally

Provisionally Permanent men, named below, who have been brought on the new revised Civil Service cadre will get higher advantages by the revision and inclusion in the Civil Service cadre. Officers who are nearing the end of their service and those recently retired, will have no advantage at all.

5. The Officers, named below, who have a very few years to retire, and who are recently retired, have absolutely no advantage by their being brought on the Civil Service cadre, because they have no chance whatever of getting into higher appointments before their retirement.

6. The Acting and Sub Protem Officers, Who have immediately benefitted by the G. O. of June 1925, were recruited on exactly the same conditions as the Officers named below and the latter cannot be strictly termed as belonging to the Civil Service (though now included) as they did not enter by competition or by nomination as Probationery Assistant Commissioners. - The Officers, who were thus appointed from the lower ranks for their good work, are (1). Mr. S. N. Appanna Iyengar, (2) Mr. G. Narayana Rao, (3) Mr. H. Vyasa Rao, (4) Mr. C. Gopala Char, (5) Mr. M. S. Ramachandra Rao, (6) Mr. T. Hanumantha Rao, (7) Mr. R. A. Narasimha Iyengar, and (8) Mr. C. Lakshmana Rao.

The Officers, who were also similarly recruited but recently retired, are:- (1) Mr. S. Reuben, (2) Mr. S. N. Sreenarasimha Sastry.

All the above Officers, and the Officers who have been given the benefit of Government Order of 19th June 1925, and given increments with retrospective effect,

effect, were recruited in exactly the same manner and on the same conditions, and as such, there seems no justice in denying equal treatment to them.

7. The cases of Officers who entered either by competition or by nomination as Probationery Assistant Commissioners, are quite different as they entered on express conditions by which they are bound, and they have all good prospects of rising to higher appointments.

8. The effect of Government Order of 19th June 1925 has been to apply the rules to one set of Officers who were not even confirmed or made provisionally permanent, and overlook those who entered almost at the same time and under exactly similar conditions, giving the former, namely Acting and Sub Protem Officers, an advantage in pay far in advance of the Officers who have been confirmed and made provisionally permanent, as will be apparent from the increments granted to Messrs. R. Shama Rao and C. Krishna Rao, who supersede in pay several of their erstwhile seniors.

9. The cases of the ten Officers abovenamed being exactly similar to those of the Acting and Sub Protem Officers, who have been given the benefit of Government Order of 19th June 1925, it is prayed that Government may graciously consider their cases favourably and order the application of the same principles to them.

10. The application of the principles laid down in the Government Order of 19th June 1925 to the ten Officers named above, will not, it is presumed, burden Government with a heavy charge, while, at the same time, it will keep in contentment Officers who have rendered long and approved service, and who are thus deserving the gracious consideration of Government. This will add a few Rupees to the pen-

sion

pension of the Two Officers already retired, and of two or three others who are to be retired in two or three years.

11. If the Government should feel any difficulty as to where to draw a line to commence the calculation for fixing initial pay on 1st. July 1923, the G. O. of the 19th June 1925 sanctioning increments to Mr. Shama Rao and others, gives a date from whence Mr. Shama Rao's period has been calculated, and this same date may be applied in our cases also.

12. If the Government consider that no more concession need be shown to those who are in service on the ground of their being benefitted by the Reorganisation Scheme, I most respectfully beg that the cases of Mr. Reuben and myself may be favourably considered since we are retired, and hence cannot expect any benefit from the Scheme.

I beg to remain,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

V. N. Srinivasamurthy Sastry

RETIRED ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER.

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT.....

Diary No. of letter replied to—

Section I

File No. 3/23

Serial No

General and Revenue Secretariat

No. 613-7

the *191*

Date of issue 5/9/25

Signed by Asst M. Venkatasa Iyengar.

To 1) The Superintendent, Rev. Survey & Settlement
2) " Deputy Commr, Mysore District
3) " Accountant General

Sir

With reference to your letter/s

No 1) 189 2 dated 1) 26th July & 2nd August 25
2) N.Dis.H.C.47/25-26 2) 21st July 1925.
3) A.D. 109 3) 4th Aug 1925

forwarding for favourable consideration the representation/s of ____ x

praying that his acting and Sub-Temporary service may be allowed to count for calculation of increments in the revised scale of pay of Asst. Commissioners as in the case of Mr. R. Shama Rao and

over.

x 1) Mr. R. A. Narasimha Iyengar and Mr. H. Vajava Rao
2) Mr. C. Narayana Rao and Mr. S. N. Krishna Iyengar
3) Mr. T. Hanumantha Rao

certain other officers of the non-civil

Service cadre I am directed

to state that the requests of

1) Mr. R. A. Narasimha Iyengar
& Mr. H. Vijaya Rao
2) Mr. G. Narayana Rao & Mr. S. I
Appanna Iengar.
3) Mr. T. Hanumantha Re

cannot be granted

I am to add that

question of relative positions between

the Civil Service and non-Civil

Service officers arises as they are

for (2) only.

[illegible] different lists altogether and

that they are not prepared to consider

favourably the request of Mr. G.

Narayana Rao to be placed

[illegible] the non-Civil Service cadre

I have etc

List of enclosures.

Chief Secretary

Copied by

Examined by

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT..

Diary No. of letter replied to–

Section C.B.
File No. 3/63
Serial No 5-6

General and Revenue Secretariat

No. 618-9

, *the* *191*

Date of issue 5/9/25

Signed by Dy. S. M. Venkatesa Iyengar

To 1) Mr. S. Reuben, Retired Asst. Cmr.
2) Mr. S. N. Srinivasimha Sastry, Retired Distt. Supdt of Police

Sir

With reference to your representations praying that the acting and Suo tem service put in by you may be allowed to count for calculation of increments in the revised scale of pay of Asst. Commissioners as in the case of Mr. R. Shama Rao and certain other officers of the non-Civil Service

over.

cadre, I am directed to state
that Government regret your request cannot be
granted

I have etc

Secy to Govt
Chief Secy
(- 4/5(1)

Govt tm
28/8/15

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by